

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 4-35 are active in the case.

The Examiner is thanked for the courteous interview conducted on August 5, 2003 in which the allowable subject matter in the application was clarified.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 2 and 3 therein as per the Examiner's suggestion. Claims 6 and 7 have had the dependency changed to depend on Claim 5. Claim 8 has been amended to delete improper Markush language. Claims 9 and 10 have had the dependency changed from Claim 5 to Claim 1, and Claim 10 has had the term "substrate" inserted after "organofunctional". Claim 13 has been amended to delete an extraneous "or" and to improve the readability of the end of the claim, where mixtures are specified. Claim 19 has been amended to add microorganisms and bacteria to the list of materials repelled by the coating of Claim 1. Basis for this limitation may be found on page 9, lines 12-16 of the specification. New Claims 20-35 have been added to preferred embodiments in which Claim 1 is rewritten as new Claim 20 in order to recite positively the presence of a free radical generator or a free radical generator and a solvent as part of the reaction. The remaining claims are rewritten to correspond to original Claims 4 and 6-19, but dependent on Claim 20. No new matter has been added into the amended claims or new claims.

The rejection of Claims 1, 4, 8 and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ogawa et al. is traversed.

With the amendment of Claim 1, this rejection is now moot.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-15, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Yoneda et al. is traversed.

With the amendment to Claim 1 and the addition of new Claims 20-35, which are amended according to the Examiner's comments concerning the pertinence of the Yoneda et al. reference on page 7 of the Official Action, it is submitted that this rejection is now moot.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikenaga et al. is traversed.

With the amendment to Claim 1 and the addition of new Claims 20-35, which are amended according to the Examiner's comments on the pertinence of the Ikenaga et al. reference on pages 9 and 10 of the Official Action, it is submitted that this rejection is now moot.

The rejection of Claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ikenaga et al. is traversed.

With the amendment to Claim 1 and the addition of Claims 20-35, discussed above, it is submitted that the claims distinguish over the reference.

The rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoneda et al. is traversed.

With the amendment to Claim 10 and the addition of Claims 20-35, discussed above, it is submitted that Claim 10 distinguishes over the reference.

The objection to Claim 10 has been corrected by the addition of the term "substrate" to the claim.

The rejection of Claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been corrected by the change in dependency of Claims 6 and 7 to depend on Claim 5.

Application No. 10/035,168
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2003

It is submitted that Claims 1 and 4-35 are allowable and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Roland Martin
Registration No. 48,082

Customer Number

22850

TEL: 703-413-3000
FAX: 703-413-2220